

July 21, 1972

Dear Jim,

You asked for my personal view of the recent meeting among the three groups (our competitor, the sponsor group, you, and my group) regarding the Supplementary Data Study. It is a little late but here briefly are my views.

1. First, my expectations (prior to the meeting) for the Phase 1 work of our competitor was a document that would serve as a requirements and performance objective for the Phase 2 design study. Such a document, in my view, should define all the data to be handled including volume, formats, information content of each form. It should also define the relationship with other supplemental and primary data, storage, retrieval and preparation frequencies, etc. Most important is an interface description (perhaps in the form of a time line) between operator(s), all displays, supplemental data and primary data for each of the three types of the primary data (and main operator functions) described in the RFP.

2. Second, the presentation given by our competitor was of a partially completed functional analysis. I found it mildly interesting, showing signs of competitor progress in learning the operational workings of the sponsor but far from being the basis (I described above) for the Phase 2 study. The functional analysis presented in many important areas to our study was rather superficial in detail and in other areas dealt with operations not pertinent to the study. The complete lack of numbers describing quantity and quality was very disappointing. Perhaps most disturbing was the lack of confidence I felt that at the scheduled conclusion of the Phase 1 study (August 1st) all the deficiencies will have been resolved adequately to then serve as the basis for the Phase 2 design study.

3. Another point I was disturbed over was the apparent lack of agreement among the sponsor group members over the objective and scope of the study and display. The limitation of the study and display to only one form of supplemental

- 2 -

data may make the contract more manageable, but it is likely to make the resultant study of little significance. I doubt if anyone can take seriously an operational concept that proposes completely separate display systems for the primary data and each kind of secondary data. I would like to see the document to be issued in early August contain a restatement by the sponsor of the scope and objective of Phase 2 that is both workable and meaningful. I must confess I'm not too optimistic that this will indeed take place.

The above, of course, is my personal view, not necessarily shared by other members of my group or our sponsor. I offer them, not to be destructively critical, but in an attempt to call your attention to what I regard as weaknesses in current status that can cause future problems for all.



STAT